

1 **6.9 LAND USE AND PLANNING**

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

2 **6.9.1 Approach to Analysis**

3 The analysis of land use impacts focussed on identification of the changes expected to result from
 4 project implementation and evaluation of the significance of such changes, based on significance
 5 criteria discussed below. The changes that would be expected to occur due to the project are
 6 identified based on information presented in Chapter 3, Project Description, and Chapter 4, Project
 7 Route Description, concerning the location of project facilities, including fiber optic cable conduit
 8 and Points of Presence (POPs), construction methods and procedures, project design and
 9 management.

10 **6.9.2 Impact Significance Criteria**

11 The significance of impacts of the project is based on the CEQA Environmental Checklist criteria
 12 (above) and whether the project would result in the following:

- 13 • Substantial changes to land uses in its vicinity, or
- 14 • Incompatibility with long-term uses on adjacent properties.

15 **6.9.3 Impact Mechanisms**

16 Proposed projects would have a significant effect if they create a physical barrier in an established
 17 community or neighborhood, such as a structure that would prevent circulation by pedestrians or
 18 vehicles. Projects would also have a significant effect if they involve uses other than those
 19 indicated for the project area in local land use plans, or if they would not comply with policies or
 20 regulations established by general or specific plans, or with those set by zoning, subdivision,
 21 grading, or other ordinances that concern land use. Compliance with land use policies and zoning
 22 regulations are intended to protect against incompatibility of adjacent uses, since incompatibility

1 of adjacent or proximate land uses can lead to substantial changes in land uses on other properties.
2 A proposed project may also have a significant impact if it would jeopardize a biological resource
3 protected by a habitat conservation or natural community conservation plan.

4 **6.9.4 Impact Assessment**

5 In general, the project would have minimal land use impact. Metromedia’s proposed networks
6 would consist of conduit alignments that would primarily be located underground within
7 previously disturbed rights-of-way of public roadways and railroads. Conduit access points
8 would be flush with ground level or in otherwise unobtrusive locations. Chapter 4, Project Route
9 Description, identifies the locations of the proposed conduit sections and Chapter 3 summarizes
10 construction methods and practices that would be used. Metromedia would comply with the
11 applicable land use and zoning requirements.

12 The construction phase would be the source of much of the temporary land use conflicts associated
13 with the project. Conduit would be installed using either open trenching or directional boring
14 techniques, as described in Chapter 3, Project Description, which would cause surface disturbance
15 for a short period during installation. Conduit installation would have no long-term impacts on
16 land use.

17 POP construction and operation would also result in minimal impacts. The POPs would be
18 constructed in accordance with applicable land use regulations, plans, and policies at locations
19 within railroad rights-of-way or on land proximate to the conduit alignment. Review of POP
20 facility architectural design and landscaping would be performed as required, prior to
21 construction. All POPs proposed to be constructed would be located in urban areas with mostly
22 industrial/commercial and transportation surrounding uses. As indicated by Table 5.9-1, all but
23 one of the POPs to be constructed outside of existing buildings would be located within railroad
24 rights-of-way.

25 No land use impacts are expected to be caused by the POP facilities that would be located in
26 existing buildings, given that no alteration of the use of existing buildings would be necessary to
27 accommodate such POPs. All of the Los Angeles Basin Network POPs and two of the San
28 Francisco Bay Area POPs would be located within existing buildings.

29 Metromedia has designed the project to include management, training, construction methods and
30 practices, and other approaches that would avoid or minimize project impacts and ensure
31 compliance with applicable standards and regulations, as described in Chapter 3, Project
32 Description. The potential land use impacts of the project are discussed below. Compliance with
33 plans and regulations related to the State Scenic Highways program are discussed in section 6.1,
34 Aesthetics.

35 **6.9.4.1 San Francisco Bay Area Network**

36 a. *Would the proposed project physically divide an established community?*

37 The project would not physically divide established communities or neighborhoods. The project
38 would consist of the installation of fiber optic conduit primarily within existing, previously
39 disturbed railroad and roadway rights-of-way and construction of ancillary facilities such as POPs.

1 All conduit would be installed underground or attached to existing bridge structures, and
2 therefore would not create a physical division of an established community.

3 Some of the proposed POP facilities proposed for this network would entail construction of new
4 buildings (in San Mateo, Redwood City, Mountain View, Palo Alto, Hayward, Fremont, and Santa
5 Clara) and would be located within railroad rights-of-way or on land owned by Metromedia
6 proximate to the conduit route. The POP facilities would range in size from 1,000 to 15,000 usable
7 square feet. POPs would be compatible with surrounding land uses and would not divide an
8 established community or neighborhood.

9 Proposed POP facilities for this network located within existing buildings (in Oakland and San
10 Jose) would not change the use of the existing building. These POP facilities would not create a
11 physical barrier in an established community or neighborhood.

12 *b. Would the proposed project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an*
13 *agency with jurisdiction over the proposed project (including, but not limited to, a general plan,*
14 *specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or*
15 *mitigating an environmental effect?*

16 **Impact LU-1:** Possible conflict with applicable local land use plans, policies, and regulations might
17 occur. (Less than Significant with Identified Mitigation)

18 Although the project is predicated upon compliance with applicable local plans and regulations
19 concerning land use, the project necessarily proposes specific locations for facilities, including
20 conduit alignments and POPs, and conflict may occur with local land use plans and regulations
21 intended to protect the environment. To implement the project, Metromedia is required to obtain,
22 at a minimum, encroachment permits to work in railroad and public rights-of-way. This process
23 provides a key early communication link with City staff and provides the opportunity to learn
24 exactly what local plans and policies apply, and what other permits may be required, if any (see
25 Appendix K for a list of jurisdictions contacted). Most jurisdictions do not have general plan
26 policies regarding telecommunications facilities, and railroad and public rights-of-way are
27 commonly used as utility corridors. Impacts from potential conflicts with land use plans and
28 policies would be less than significant as long as the project complies with the applicable plans,
29 policies, and regulations.

30 **Mitigation Measure LU-1:** Metromedia would comply with local plans, policies, and regulations.

31 As described in Chapter 3, Project Description, Metromedia would identify and comply with
32 applicable local plans, policies, and regulations, including obtaining necessary local zoning
33 permits and meeting conditions for approval, prior to commencing construction activities
34 associated with the installation of conduit and construction of POP facilities.

35 *c. Would the proposed project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural*
36 *community conservation plan?*

37 There are no habitat conservation or natural community conservation plans applicable to the area
38 where the project would be located.

1 *d. Would the proposed project cause other significant land use effects?*

2 Short-term construction activities adjacent to sensitive receptors identified in section 5.9.2.1 would
3 result in temporary land use conflicts. Nuisance noise, air quality emissions, visibility of
4 construction equipment and traffic congestion would occur along new build segments and at the 7
5 POP construction locations. However, these temporary incompatibilities would not preclude
6 adjacent land uses. Impacts would be less than significant.

7 The conduit alignments of the project would not cause any long-term effects on land use. POP
8 facilities would comply with applicable zoning requirements and would be compatible with
9 surrounding land uses, and therefore would not cause substantial changes to other land uses in
10 their vicinity or be incompatible with existing long-term uses on adjacent properties.

11 **6.9.4.2 Los Angeles Basin Network**

12 *a. Would the proposed project physically divide an established community?*

13 The project would not physically divide established communities or neighborhoods. The project
14 would consist of the installation of fiber optic conduit primarily within existing, previously
15 disturbed railroad and roadway rights-of-way and construction of ancillary facilities such as POPs.
16 All conduit would be installed underground or attached to existing bridge structures, and
17 therefore would not create a physical division of an established community.

18 All proposed POPs for the Los Angeles Basin Network would be located within existing buildings
19 and would result in no change in the use of the existing building. No physical barriers in an
20 established community or neighborhood would result. Impacts would be less than significant.

21 *b. Would the proposed project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an*
22 *agency with jurisdiction over the proposed project (including, but not limited to, a general plan,*
23 *specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or*
24 *mitigating an environmental effect?*

25 Impact LU-1 would apply to the Los Angeles Basin Network (see section 6.9.4.1). Implementation
26 of measure LU-1 would reduce impacts to less than significant.

27 *c. Would the proposed project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural*
28 *community conservation plan?*

29 There are no habitat conservation or natural community conservation plans applicable to the area
30 where the project would be located.

31 *d. Would the proposed project cause other significant land use effects?*

32 Short-term construction activities adjacent to sensitive receptors identified in section 5.9.2.2 would
33 result in temporary land use conflicts. Nuisance noise, air quality emissions, visibility of
34 construction equipment and traffic congestion would occur along new build segments. However,
35 these temporary incompatibilities would not preclude adjacent land uses. Impacts would be less
36 than significant.

- 1 The conduit alignments of the project would not cause any long-term effects on land use. The POP
- 2 facilities would be located within existing buildings, in locations appropriate for such a use, and
- 3 therefore would not cause substantial changes to other land uses in their vicinity or be
- 4 incompatible with existing long-term uses on adjacent properties.